arXiv:1510.02862v1 [math.PR] 10 Oct 2015

MODERATE DEVIATIONS FOR THE MILDLY STATIONARY AUTOREGRESSIVE MODELS WITH DEPENDENT ERRORS

Hui Jiang, Mingming Yu

Department of Mathematics, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics
Nanjing 210016, P.R.China

huijiang@nuaa.edu.cn, mengyilianmeng@163.com

Guangyu Yang

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Zhengzhou University
Zhengzhou 450001, P.R.China

guangyu@zzu.edu.cn

Abstract. In this paper, we consider the normalized least squares estimator of the parameter in a mildly stationary first-order autoregressive model with dependent errors which are modeled as a mildly stationary AR(1) process. By martingale methods, we establish the moderate deviations for the least squares estimators of the regressor and error, which can be applied to understand the near-integrated second order autoregressive processes. As an application, we obtain the moderate deviations for the Durbin-Watson statistic.

AMS 2010 subject classification: 60F10, 60G42, 62J05.

Keywords: Durbin-Watson statistic, martingale difference, mildly stationary autoregressive processes, moderate deviations.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Main results 4
2.1. Assumptions 4
2.2. Moderate deviations 4
2.3. Some discussions 6
3. Some preparations and auxiliary results 7
3.1. Decomposition of estimators 8
3.2. Martingales and predictable quadratic variations 9
4. Moderate deviations for $\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n$ and $\hat{d}_n$ 13
4.1. Moderate deviations for $(\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$ 13
4.2. Moderate deviations for $\hat{d}_n$ 19
5. Technical appendix and proofs 20
Acknowledgements 27
References 27

1. Introduction

Regression asymptotics with roots at or near unity have played an important role in time series econometrics. In order to cover more general time series structure, it has become popular in econometric methodology to study the models which permit that the regressors and the errors have substantial heterogeneity and dependence over time. This work is devoted to analyse a dynamic first order autoregressive model which the errors are dependent. More precisely, we consider the asymptotic behavior of the least squares estimators of the following autoregressive model,

$$\begin{cases} X_{k,n} = \theta_n X_{k-1,n} + \varepsilon_{k,n}, \\ \varepsilon_{k,n} = \rho_n \varepsilon_{k-1,n} + V_k, \end{cases} \qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n,\ n \geq 1, \tag{1.1}$$

where the unknown parameters θ_n, $\rho_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $(X_{k,n})_{0 \leq k \leq n}$ is observed, and the noise $(V_k)_{k \geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with zero mean and a finite variance σ^2. For convenience, let $X_{0,n} = \varepsilon_{0,n} = 0$ for every $n \geq 1$. We take two-stage methods to estimate the unknown parameters, θ_n and ρ_n. It is well-known that the least squares estimator of θ_n based on the observed variables is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,n} X_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^2}, \quad n \geq 1. \tag{1.2}$$

To obtain the estimator of ρ_n, we substitute $\hat{\theta}_n$ for θ_n in (1.1), and denote the residuals by

$$\hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} = X_{k,n} - \hat{\theta}_n X_{k-1,n}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \tag{1.3}$$

then the least squares estimator of ρ_n can be defined as

$$\hat{\rho}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n}^2}, \quad n \geq 1, \tag{1.4}$$

where $\hat{\varepsilon}_{0,n} := 0$ for every $n \geq 1$. As pointed out by King [16], the following Durbin-Watson statistic,

$$\hat{d}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (\hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2}, \quad n \geq 1, \tag{1.5}$$

also plays an important role in the test of the serial correlation.

The model (1.1) has a close connection with some existing models. Firstly, we fix the autoregressive coefficient θ_n, i.e. let $\theta_n \equiv \theta$. If $\rho_n \equiv 0$, then the model (1.1) is precisely the classic autoregressive process with i.i.d. errors. In this case, the asymptotic behaviors of $\hat{\theta}_n$ have been examined thoroughly. For example, when the model is *stationary* ($|\theta| < 1$), under some moment conditions, Anderson [1] showed asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_n$. However, as pointed out previously by Anderson [1], White [24], and Dickey & Fuller [12], the situation becomes more complicated for the *critical* case ($|\theta| = 1$) and the *explosive* case ($|\theta| > 1$), where the limiting distributions are functionals of Brownian motion and standard Cauchy, respectively. In addition, if the regressive coefficient ρ_n in the errors is also fixed, i.e. $\rho_n \equiv \rho$, to answer some open problems on the Durbin-Watson statistic, Bercu and Proïa [4] investigated the asymptotic normality of the least squares estimators $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$, in the stationary case, i.e. $|\theta| < 1$ and $|\rho| < 1$.

Secondly, we assume the regression parameter is *time-varying*, i.e. θ_n depending on the sample size n. If $\rho_n \equiv 0$ and $\theta_n = O(n^{-1})$, then the model (1.1) turns to be the *near unit root processes* raised by Bobkoski [6] and Cavanagh [7] to understand the phenomenon that the discriminatory power of statistical tests for the presence of unit root is generally quite low against the alternative of root which is close, but not equal, to unity. Phillips [21] and Chan & Wei [8] established that the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the stochastic integration of some exponential function with respect to Brownian motion. If $\rho_n \equiv 0$ and $\theta_n = O(n^{-\alpha})$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then the model (1.1) turns to be the *mildly autoregressive model* raised by Phillips & Magdalinos [22]. It is interesting that their results *match* the standard limit theory of the *time-invariant* model and partially bridge the stationary, the local to unity and the explosive cases.

In fact, Nabeya & Perron [20] once introduced the model (1.1), where $\theta_n = 1 + \frac{\gamma_1}{n}$ and $\rho_n = 1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{n}$ for some fixed γ_1 and γ_2. They showed that the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}_n$ is the functional of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. And they also pointed out that the model (1.1) can be regarded as an approximate version of the second order autoregressive process with two unit roots.

Then, motivated by above discussions, we will consider the *time-varying* model (1.1) and devote to the asymptotic properties of the least squares estimators, $\hat{\theta}_n$, $\hat{\rho}_n$, and the Durbin-Watson statistic, $\hat{d}_n$. In the preprint [15], we proved the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_n$, $\hat{\rho}_n$ and $\hat{d}_n$ when $|\theta_n| \to 1$ and $|\rho_n| \to 1$ both within stationary or explosive regions. It is well known that the large deviation estimates have proved to be the crucial tool required to handle many questions in statistics, engineering, statistical mechanics, and applied probabilities. The object of the present paper is to establish the moderate deviation principle of $\hat{\theta}_n$, $\hat{\rho}_n$ and $\hat{d}_n$, when $|\theta_n| \to 1$ and $|\rho_n| \to 1$ both within the stationary regions. For the classic autoregressive model, i.e. $\theta_n \equiv \theta$ and $\rho_n \equiv 0$, Bercu [2] and Worms [25] provided the large deviation estimates of $\hat{\theta}_n$ in the stationary, critical and explosive cases when the noise is Gaussian. Miao & Shen [18] proved the moderate deviation principle of $\hat{\theta}_n$ for general i.i.d. noise which satisfies Gaussian integrability. Very recently, Miao *et al.* [19] extended the results in [18] to the time-varying model, and obtained the moderate deviations of $\hat{\theta}_n$ when $\rho_n \equiv 0$ and $\theta_n \to 1$ within the stationary regions, which also match the standard limit theory of the time-invariant model. While Bitseki Penda *et al.* [5] studied the moderate deviations of $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$ for the model (1.1) when $\theta_n \equiv \theta$ and $\rho_n \equiv \rho$ both in stationary cases, and the noise satisfies a less restrictive Chen-Ledoux type condition. As an application, they obtained the moderate deviation principle of the Durbin-Watson statistic.

The main contribution of this paper is to extend the results in [5] to the time-varying model (1.1) when $|\theta_n| \to 1$ and $|\rho_n| \to 1$ both within the stationary regions. It is interesting that, when θ_n and ρ_n have opposite signs, the estimators $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$ have the same rates of convergence and rate functions. In addition, we remark that the methods of proof mainly rely on the deviation inequalities for martingale arrays and our results can also be applied to understand the near-integrated second order autoregressive processes. The rest of this article is organized as follows. The next section is devoted to the descriptions of our main results. To prove the main results, in Section 3, we will give the decomposition of the estimators and

prove some auxiliary results. Then the proofs of main results are completed in the remaining sections.

2. Main results

2.1. **Assumptions.** For the model (1.1), let $(V_n)_{n\geq 1}$ be a sequence of real valued i.i.d. random variables with zero mean and a finite variance σ^2, and V_1 satisfies the Gaussian integrability condition, i.e. for some $t_0 > 0$,

$$E\left(\exp\{t_0 V_1^2\}\right) < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Consider the following two cases of θ_n and ρ_n:

$$\text{(Case I)} \qquad \theta_n = 1 + \frac{\gamma_1}{\kappa_n}, \quad \rho_n = 1 + \frac{\gamma_2}{\kappa_n}, \qquad \gamma_1 < 0,\ \gamma_2 < 0;$$

$$\text{(Case II)} \qquad \theta_n = 1 + \frac{\gamma_1}{\kappa_n}, \quad \rho_n = -1 - \frac{\gamma_2}{\kappa_n}, \qquad \gamma_1 < 0,\ \gamma_2 < 0.$$

For the above cases, $(b_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\lambda_n)_{n\geq 1}$ are two sequences of positive numbers and satisfy that

(H-I) $(b_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence of increasing positive numbers satisfying

$$b_n \to \infty, \quad \frac{n}{b_n^6 \kappa_n^2} \to \infty, \quad \frac{n}{b_n^2 \kappa_n^5} \to \infty, \text{ and } \quad \frac{n b_n^2}{\kappa_n^5 \log^2 n} \to \infty;$$

(H-II) $(\lambda_n)_{n\geq 1}$ is a sequence of increasing positive numbers satisfying

$$\lambda_n \to \infty, \quad \frac{n}{\lambda_n^6 \kappa_n^6} \to \infty, \quad \frac{n}{\lambda_n^2 \kappa_n^{11}} \to \infty, \text{ and } \quad \frac{n \lambda_n^2}{\kappa_n^7 \log^2 n} \to \infty.$$

Moreover, we need the following Chen-Ledoux condition [9], [13], [17]:

(C-L (a_n)) as $n \to \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{a_n^2} \log n P\left(|V_1|^4 > a_n \sqrt{n}\right) \to -\infty, \tag{2.2}$$

where $a_n = b_n$ or λ_n. Note that, if V_1 is a Gaussian random variable, then the condition (C-L (a_n)) holds.

For the convenience of statement, throughout this paper, we always assume that under (Case I), conditions (H-I) and (C-L (b_n)) hold; under (Case II), conditions (H-II) and (C-L (λ_n)) are valid.

2.2. **Moderate deviations.** For some convenience, denote

$$\theta_n^* = \frac{\theta_n + \rho_n}{1 + \theta_n \rho_n}, \quad \rho_n^* = \theta_n \rho_n \theta_n^*, \quad d_n^* = 2(1 - \rho_n^*) \tag{2.3}$$

and

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -2(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.4}$$

Theorem 2.1. *Under (Case I),*

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{b_n} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n \kappa_n^3}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*) \\ \sqrt{n \kappa_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*) \end{pmatrix}, \, n \geq 1 \right\}$$

satisfies the large deviation principle with the speed b_n^2 and good rate function

$$I_{\theta,\rho}(x) := \frac{x^\tau \Gamma^{-1} x}{2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.5}$$

That is, for any Borel subset $E \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\inf_{x\in E^\circ} I_{\theta,\rho}(x) &\le \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{1}{b_n}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}(\hat\theta_n - \theta_n^*)\\ \sqrt{n\kappa_n}(\hat\rho_n - \rho_n^*)\end{pmatrix} \in E\right) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{1}{b_n}\begin{pmatrix}\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}(\hat\theta_n - \theta_n^*)\\ \sqrt{n\kappa_n}(\hat\rho_n - \rho_n^*)\end{pmatrix} \in E\right) \\ &\le -\inf_{x\in \bar E} I_{\theta,\rho}(x), \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where, E° and $\bar E$ denote the interior and closure of E respectively.

In particular, $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}(\hat\theta_n - \theta_n^*),\, n \ge 1\right\}$ and $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n}(\hat\rho_n - \rho_n^*),\, n \ge 1\right\}$ satisfy the large deviation principle with the speed b_n^2 and good rate functions

$$I_\theta(x) := -\frac{x^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \quad \text{and} \quad I_\rho(x) := -\frac{x^2}{4(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \tag{2.7}$$

respectively.

From the preprint paper of Jiang *et al.* [15], we know that, under (Case II), the covariance of limiting distribution of $\hat\theta_n$ and $\hat\rho_n$ is singular. Therefore, in this situation, we study the moderate deviations for each estimator individually.

Theorem 2.2. *Under (Case II),*

$$\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}}{\lambda_n}(\hat\theta_n - \theta_n^*),\, n \ge 1\right\}, \quad \left\{\frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}}{\lambda_n}(\hat\rho_n - \rho_n^*),\, n \ge 1\right\}$$

satisfy the large deviation principle with the speed λ_n^2 and same good rate functions

$$J(x) := -\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3 x^2}{16\gamma_1\gamma_2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{2.8}$$

Remark 2.1. *For the time-invariant models, i.e. $\theta_n \equiv \theta$ and $\rho_n \equiv \rho$, Bitseki Penda et al. [5] showed that, when $\theta = -\rho$, $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\lambda_n}(\hat\theta_n - \theta_n^*), n \ge 1\right\}$ and $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\lambda_n}(\hat\rho_n - \rho_n^*), n \ge 1\right\}$ have different rate functions.*

As an application of Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, for the Durbin-Watson statistic $\hat d_n$, we have the following result.

Corollary 2.1. *Define*

$$I_d(x) = -\frac{x^2}{16(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \quad J_d(x) = -\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3 x^2}{64\gamma_1\gamma_2}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2.9}$$

then, for any $x > 0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n}|\hat d_n - d_n^*| \ge x\right) = -I_d(x), & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}}{\lambda_n}|\hat d_n - d_n^*| \ge x\right) = -J_d(x), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}. \tag{2.10}$$

2.3. **Some discussions.** It is worthwhile to give some additional comments on our results and other related problems.

(1) In fact, under an additional symmetry assumption on the distribution of the noise $(V_k)_{k\geq 1}$, Theorem 2.1 holds in the case, $\theta_n \to -1$ and $\rho_n \to -1$, both within the stationary regions. Suppose that

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} X_{k,n} & = \theta_n X_{k-1,n} + \varepsilon_{k,n}, \\ \varepsilon_{k,n} & = \rho_n \varepsilon_{k-1,n} + V_k, \end{array}\right. \qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n,\ n \geq 1,$$

where the unknown parameters $\theta_n, \rho_n \in (-1, 0]$, and $(V_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with a symmetric distribution. Denote

$$\alpha_n = -\theta_n, \quad \beta_n = -\rho_n,$$
$$Y_{k,n} = (-1)^k X_{k,n}, \quad \eta_{k,n} = (-1)^k \varepsilon_{k,n}, \quad W_k = (-1)^k V_k,$$

then $(W_k)_{k\geq 1}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with the same common distribution as that of V_1, $\alpha_n, \beta_n \in [0, 1)$ and

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} Y_{k,n} & = \alpha_n Y_{k-1,n} + \eta_{k,n}, \\ \eta_{k,n} & = \beta_n \eta_{k-1,n} + W_k, \end{array}\right. \qquad k = 1, 2, \ldots, n,\ n \geq 1.$$

Putting

$$\theta_n^* = \frac{\theta_n + \rho_n}{1 + \theta_n \rho_n}, \quad \rho_n^* = \theta_n \rho_n \theta_n^*, \quad d_n^* = 2(1 - \rho_n^*),$$
$$\alpha_n^* = \frac{\alpha_n + \beta_n}{1 + \alpha_n \beta_n}, \quad \beta_n^* = \alpha_n \beta_n \alpha_n^*, \quad e_n^* = 2(1 - \beta_n^*),$$
$$\hat{\theta}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k,n} X_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^2}, \quad \hat{\alpha}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n Y_{k,n} Y_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n Y_{k-1,n}^2},$$
$$\hat{\rho}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n}^2}, \quad \hat{\beta}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{k,n} \hat{\eta}_{k-1,n}}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{k-1,n}^2},$$
$$\hat{d}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (\hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2}, \quad \hat{e}_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^n (\hat{\eta}_{k,n} - \hat{\eta}_{k-1,n})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^n \hat{\eta}_{k,n}^2},$$

where $\hat{\eta}_{k,n} = Y_{k,n} - \hat{\alpha}_n Y_{k-1,n}$, we know that

$$\theta_n^* = -\alpha_n^*, \quad \rho_n^* = -\beta_n^*, \quad d_n^* = e_n^*,$$

and

$$\hat{\alpha}_n = -\hat{\theta}_n, \quad \hat{\beta}_n = -\hat{\rho}_n, \quad \hat{e}_n = \hat{d}_n.$$

If the corresponding assumptions are satisfied, then Theorem 2.1 holds for the least squares estimators, $\hat{\alpha}_n$ and $\hat{\beta}_n$, hence also holds for $\hat{\theta}_n$, $\hat{\rho}_n$. For Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.1, we have similar results.

(2) Theorem 2.1, Theorem 2.2 and Corollary 2.1 *match* the following standard stationary moderate deviations for *time-invariant* model developed in [5],

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n} |\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_\theta^2}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n} |\hat{\rho}_n - \rho^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_\rho^2}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n} |\hat{d}_n - d^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_d^2}, \end{array}\right. \tag{2.11}$$

where, $\sigma_d^2 = 4\sigma_\rho^2$ and

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_\theta^2 &= \frac{(1-\theta^2)(1-\theta\rho)(1-\rho^2)}{(1+\theta\rho)^3}, \\ \sigma_\rho^2 &= \frac{(1-\theta\rho)((\theta+\rho)^2(1+\theta\rho)^2+\theta^2\rho^2(1-\theta^2)(1-\rho^2))}{(1+\theta\rho)^3}. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Substituting $1-\theta_n^2 = -\frac{2\gamma_1}{\kappa_n}(1+o(1))$, $1-\rho_n^2 = -\frac{2\gamma_2}{\kappa_n}(1+o(1))$, and θ_n^*, ρ_n^*, d_n^* into the above results, we have the asymptotic approximation

$$\begin{cases} \sigma_\theta^2 \sim -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{2\kappa_n^3}, \quad \sigma_\rho^2 \sim -\frac{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\kappa_n}, \quad \sigma_d^2 \sim -\frac{8(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\kappa_n}, & \text{Case I} \\ \sigma_\theta^2 \sim -\frac{8\kappa_n\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}, \quad \sigma_\rho^2 \sim -\frac{8\kappa_n\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}, \quad \sigma_d^2 \sim -\frac{32\kappa_n\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}, & \text{Case II} \end{cases},$$

which just correspond to our results.

(3) Note that $|\theta_n| \to 1$ and $|\rho_n| \to 1$, are both within the stationary regions, hence, our results, maybe provide a bridge between those for local to unity processes and those that apply under stationarity. Given $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in (-1, 0)$, let $\kappa_n = n^\delta$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$, under (Case I), by Theorem 2.1, Corollary 2.1, and letting $\delta \to 0$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*| \geq x\right) \sim \frac{x^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*| \geq x\right) \sim \frac{x^2}{4(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{d}_n - d_n^*| \geq x\right) \sim \frac{x^2}{16(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \end{cases}$$

however, the correct stationary results for the time-invariant model when $\theta = 1+\gamma_1$ and $\rho = 1+\gamma_2$, are

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_{1+\gamma_1}^2}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{\rho}_n - \rho^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{2\sigma_{1+\gamma_2}^2}, \\ \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}|\hat{d}_n - d^*| \geq x\right) \sim -\frac{x^2}{8\sigma_{1+\gamma_2}^2}. \end{cases}$$

That is to say, the variation of coefficients of the model (1.1) changes the variances of $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$. Similar phenomena also appear under (Case II). In particular, if $\theta_n = -\rho_n$, i.e. $\gamma_1 = \gamma_2 =: \gamma$, from above procedures we have

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\lambda_n}|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*| \geq x\right) \sim \frac{\gamma x^2}{2}, \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\lambda_n}|\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*| \geq x\right) \sim \frac{\gamma x^2}{2}. \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

However, here the correct variances for the time-invariant model are

$$\sigma_{1+\gamma}^2 = -\frac{\gamma^2+2\gamma+2}{\gamma^2+2\gamma}, \qquad \sigma_{-1-\gamma}^2 = -\frac{(1+\gamma)^4(\gamma^2+2\gamma+2)}{\gamma^2+2\gamma},$$

which are smaller than $-1/\gamma$, i.e. the variation of coefficients of the model (1.1) causes overestimates on the variances of $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$.

(4) Finally, we point out that, it maybe more interesting when $|\theta_n| \to 1$ and $|\rho_n| \to 1$ within different regions and with different orders.

3. Some preparations and auxiliary results

In order to prove our main results, in this section, we first deal with the decompositions of $\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*$ and $\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*$, and then study some associated martingales.

3.1. **Decomposition of estimators.** To obtain the decompositions of $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\hat{\rho}_n$, we first introduce some notations. For all $1 \le l \le n$, let

$$M_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} X_{k-1,n} V_k, \quad N_{l,n} = \sum_{k=2}^{l} X_{k-2,n} V_k, \quad U_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \varepsilon_{k-1,n} V_k, \tag{3.1}$$

and

$$P_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} X_{k,n} X_{k-1,n}, \; Q_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} X_{k,n} \varepsilon_{k,n}, \; S_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} X_{k,n}^2, \; T_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \varepsilon_{k,n}^2. \tag{3.2}$$

In addition, denote $M_n := M_{n,n}$, and the same definitions for N_n, U_n, P_n, Q_n, S_n and T_n. Then, from (1.1), (1.2), and (2.3), it follows that

$$\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^* = \frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} \cdot \frac{M_n}{S_{n-1,n}} + \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} \cdot \frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{S_{n-1,n}}. \tag{3.3}$$

As for the decomposition of $\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*$, we need more notations. For $1 \le l \le n$, let

$$I_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}\hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n}, \quad J_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2, \quad I_{n,n} := I_n, \quad J_{n,n} := J_n. \tag{3.4}$$

Based on the idea in Bercu & Proïa [4], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &J_{n-1,n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*) \\ &= \left(\frac{1+\theta_n^*\rho_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} - \frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n}\right) M_n + \frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n} U_n - (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*) H_n + \xi_n^I - \rho_n^* \xi_n^J, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &H_n = F_n - \rho_n^* G_n, \quad F_n = S_n + W_n - (\hat{\theta}_n + \theta_n^*) P_n, \quad G_n = 2P_n - (\hat{\theta}_n + \theta_n^*) S_n, \\ &W_n = \sum_{k=2}^{n} X_{k,n} X_{k-2,n}, \quad \xi_n^I = \hat{\theta}_n X_{n,n}^2 - \hat{\theta}_n^2 X_{n,n} X_{n-1,n} + \frac{1+(\theta_n^*)^2}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} \xi_n^P - \theta_n^* \xi_n^Q, \\ &\xi_n^J = -X_{n,n}^2 + 2\hat{\theta}_n X_{n,n} X_{n-1,n} - \hat{\theta}_n^2 (X_{n,n}^2 + X_{n-1,n}^2) - \frac{2\theta_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} \xi_n^P, \\ &\xi_n^P = \theta_n\rho_n X_n X_{n-1,n} - (\theta_n + \rho_n) X_{n,n}^2, \\ &\xi_n^Q = \theta_n^* \xi_n^P - (\theta_n + \rho_n) X_{n,n} X_{n-1,n} + \theta_n\rho_n (X_{n,n}^2 + X_{n-1,n}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

Then, we can write that

$$\begin{cases} \frac{1}{b_n} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*) \\ \sqrt{n\kappa_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} Y_n Z_n + \frac{1}{b_n} R_n(\theta,\rho), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{n/\kappa_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*) \\ \sqrt{n/\kappa_n}(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*) \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} \tilde{Y}_n M_n + \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \tilde{R}_n(\theta,\rho), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}, \tag{3.7}$$

where, for all $1 \le l \le n$,

$$Z_{l,n} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{M_{l,n}}{\kappa_n} \\ \\ U_{l,n} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad Z_{n,n} := Z_n, \tag{3.8}$$

$$Y_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n\kappa_n^3}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)S_{n-1,n}} & 0 \\ \frac{n\kappa_n^2}{J_{n-1,n}}\left(\frac{1+\theta_n^*\rho_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} - \frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n}\right) & \frac{n\kappa_n\theta_n^*}{\theta_n J_{n-1,n}} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\tilde{Y}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{n}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)S_{n-1,n}} \\ \frac{n}{J_{n-1,n}}\left(\frac{1+\theta_n^*\rho_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} - \frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n} - \frac{H_n}{S_{n-1,n}(1+\theta_n\rho_n)}\right) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$R_n(\theta,\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}\theta_n\rho_n X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)S_{n-1,n}} \\ \frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{J_{n-1,n}}\left(-(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)H_n + \xi_n^I - \rho_n^*\xi_n^J\right) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.11}$$

and

$$\tilde{R}_n(\theta,\rho) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}\theta_n\rho_n X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)S_{n-1,n}} \\ \frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}}{J_{n-1,n}}\left(\frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n}U_n - \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}\cdot\frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{S_{n-1,n}}H_n + \xi_n^I - \rho_n^*\xi_n^J\right) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.12}$$

3.2. **Martingales and predictable quadratic variations.** For $1 \le l \le n$, denote $\mathcal{F}_{l,n} = \sigma(V_1, ..., V_l)$, then we know that, $(M_{l,n})_{1\le l\le n}$, $(N_{l,n})_{1\le l\le n}$, and $(U_{l,n})_{1\le l\le n}$ are all martingales with respect to the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{l,n})_{1\le l\le n}$, with predictable quadratic variations

$$< M_{\bullet,n} >_l = \sigma^2 S_{l-1,n}, \quad < N_{\bullet,n} >_l = \sigma^2 S_{l-2,n}, \quad < U_{\bullet,n} >_l = \sigma^2 T_{l-1,n}, \tag{3.13}$$

and predictable quadratic covariations

$$< M_{\bullet,n}, N_{\bullet,n} >_l = \sigma^2 P_{l-1,n}, \qquad < M_{\bullet,n}, U_{\bullet,n} >_l = \sigma^2 Q_{l-1,n}. \tag{3.14}$$

We first recall a result of large deviations for i.i.d. random variables.

Lemma 3.1 (Eichelsbacher & Löwe [13])**.** *Let*

$$L_n = \sum_{k=1}^n V_k^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_n = \sum_{k=1}^n V_k^4. \tag{3.15}$$

Under (Case I) and (Case II), $\left\{\frac{L_n - n\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}a_n}, n \ge 1\right\}$ *and* $\left\{\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{\sqrt{n}a_n}, n \ge 1\right\}$ *satisfy the large deviation principle with speed* a_n^2 *and rate functions*

$$I_L(x) = \frac{x^2}{2E(V_1^2 - \sigma^2)^2} \quad \text{and} \quad I_\Lambda(x) = \frac{x^2}{2E(V_1^4 - EV_1^4)^2}, \tag{3.16}$$

respectively, where $a_n = b_n$ *or* λ_n*.*

Then, using Lemma 3.1, we can show that $\frac{M_n}{n}$, $\frac{N_n}{n}$ and $\frac{U_n}{n}$ are asymptotic negligible in the sense of moderate deviations.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* $a_n = b_n$ *in (Case I) and* $a_n = \lambda_n$ *in (Case II), we have (a) for any* $\delta > 0$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|M_n|}{n} > \delta\right) = -\infty, \quad \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|N_n|}{n} > \delta\right) = -\infty;$$

(b) for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|U_n|}{n} > \delta\right) = -\infty.$$

Proof. For part (a), we only need to prove the result for M_n because the asymptotic negligibility of $\frac{N_n}{n}$ can be obtained similarly. Since $(M_{l,n})_{1\le l\le n}$ is a locally square integrable martingale, we infer that, from Theorem 2.1 of Bercu & Touati [3], for all x, $y > 0$,

$$P\left(|M_n| > x, < M_{\bullet,n} >_n + [M_{\bullet,n}]_n \le y\right) \le 2\exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{2y}\right\}, \tag{3.17}$$

where the total quadratic variation $[M_{\bullet,n}]_n = \sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^2 V_k^2$. By (3.17), we have, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\frac{|M_n|}{n} > \delta\right) &\le P\left(|M_n| > \delta n, < M_{\bullet,n} >_n + [M_{\bullet,n}]_n \le n\kappa_n^5\right) \\ &\quad + P\left(< M_{\bullet,n} >_n + [M_{\bullet,n}]_n > n\kappa_n^5\right) \\ &\le 2\exp\left\{-\frac{\delta^2 n}{2\kappa_n^5}\right\} + P\left(< M_{\bullet,n} >_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right) + P\left([M_{\bullet,n}]_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

According to (A.8) and (A.9) in Bercu & Proïa [4], we have for any $a > 0$

$$\sum_{k=1}^n |X_{k,n}|^a \le (1 - |\theta|_n)^{-a} (1 - |\rho|_n)^{-a} \sum_{k=1}^n |V_k|^a \tag{3.18}$$

Put $\Xi_{l,n} := \sum_{k=1}^l X_{k,n}^4$ and $\Xi_n := \Xi_{n,n}$, then by (3.18),

$$< M_{\bullet,n} >_n = \sigma^2 S_{n-1,n} \le \frac{\sigma^2\kappa_n^4}{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2} L_n \quad \text{and} \quad [M_{\bullet,n}]_n \le \Xi_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{\kappa_n^4}{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2}\Lambda_n. \tag{3.19}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(< M_{\bullet,n} >_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right) + P\left([M_{\bullet,n}]_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right) \\ &\le P\left(\frac{L_n - n\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}a_n} > \frac{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2\sqrt{n}\kappa_n}{2\sigma^2 a_n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}\sigma^2\right) + P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{\sqrt{n}a_n} > \frac{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2\sqrt{n}\kappa_n}{a_n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}EV_1^4\right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1 and the fact that, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\frac{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2\sqrt{n}\kappa_n}{2\sigma^2 a_n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}\sigma^2 \to \infty, \quad \frac{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2\sqrt{n}\kappa_n}{a_n} - \frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}EV_1^4 \to \infty,$$

we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2}\left(\log P\left(< M_{\bullet,n} >_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right) \vee \log P\left([M_{\bullet,n}]_n > \frac{n\kappa_n^5}{2}\right)\right) = -\infty,$$

which achieves the proof of part (a).

For part (b), applying (3.18), we can write that

$$< U_{\bullet,n} >_n = \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon_{k,n}^2 \le \frac{\sigma^2\kappa_n^2}{\gamma_2^2} L_n \quad \text{and} \quad [U_{\bullet,n}]_n = \sum_{k=1}^n \varepsilon_{k-1,n}^2 V_k^2 \le \frac{\kappa_n^2}{\gamma_2^2}\Lambda_n. \tag{3.20}$$

Hence, similar to the proof of part (a) in Lemma 3.2, we have

$$P\left(\frac{|U_n|}{n}>\delta\right)\le 2\exp\left\{-\frac{\delta^2 n}{2\kappa_n^3}\right\}+P\left(<U_{\bullet,n}>_n>\frac{n\kappa_n^3}{2}\right)+P\left([U_{\bullet,n}]_n>\frac{n\kappa_n^3}{2}\right)$$
$$\le P\left(\frac{L_n-n\sigma^2}{\sqrt{n}a_n}>\frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}\left(\frac{\gamma_2^2\kappa_n}{2\sigma^2}-\sigma^2\right)\right)+P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n-nEV_1^4}{\sqrt{n}a_n}>\frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}\left(\gamma_2^2\kappa_n-EV_1^4\right)\right),$$

which, together with Lemma 3.1, yields that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|U_n|}{n}>\delta\right)=-\infty.$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *We have*

(a) for any $\delta>0$,

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\max_{1\le k\le n}X_{k,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\max_{1\le k\le n}X_{k,n}^2}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases};$$

(b) for any $\delta>0$,

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n\kappa_n}+\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)\sigma^2}{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases},$$

and

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{P_n}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{P_n}{n\kappa_n}-\frac{(\gamma_1-\gamma_2)\sigma^2}{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases};$$

(c) let $a_n=b_n$ in (Case I) and $a_n=\lambda_n$ in (Case II), for any $\delta>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{T_n}{n\kappa_n}+\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_2}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty;$$

(d) for any $\delta>0$,

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{Q_n}{n\kappa_n^2}-\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{Q_n}{n\kappa_n}+\frac{\sigma^2}{4\gamma_2}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases}.$$

Proof. For part (a), according to (A.6) and (A.7) in Bercu & Proïa [4],

$$\max_{1\le k\le n}X_{k,n}^2\le\frac{\kappa_n^2}{\gamma_1^2}\max_{1\le k\le n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2\quad\text{and}\quad\max_{1\le k\le n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2\le\frac{\kappa_n^2}{\gamma_2^2}\max_{1\le k\le n}V_k^2,\tag{3.21}$$

we can see that

$$\max_{1\le k\le n}X_{k,n}^2\le\frac{\kappa_n^4}{\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2}\max_{1\le k\le n}V_k^2,$$

which implies that, for the $t_0>0$ in (2.1),

$$P\left(\max_{1\le k\le n}X_{k,n}^2>x\right)\le P\left(\max_{1\le k\le n}V_k^2>\frac{x\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2}{\kappa_n^4}\right)$$
$$\le n\exp\left\{-\frac{t_0x\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2}{\kappa_n^4}\right\}E\exp\{t_0V_1^2\}.$$

Hence, under (Case I),

$$\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\max_{1\le k\le n} X_{k,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right)$$
$$\le \frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-5}}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\log n}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-5}}} - t_0\delta\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2 + \frac{\log E\exp\{t_0V_1^2\}}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-5}}}\right)\to -\infty.$$

On the other hand, under (Case II),

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\max_{1\le k\le n} X_{k,n}^2}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right)$$
$$\le \frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-7}}}{\lambda_n}\left(\frac{\log n}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-7}}} - t_0\delta\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^2 + \frac{\log E\exp\{t_0V_1^2\}}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^{-7}}}\right)\to -\infty.$$

Then the proof of part (a) is completed.

For part (b), by (A.14) and (A.23) in Bercu & Proïa [4], we can obtain that

$$\begin{cases} S_n = \frac{1+\theta_n\rho_n}{(1-\theta_n\rho_n)(1-\theta_n^2)(1-\rho_n^2)}(L_n + R_{n1}), \\ P_n = \theta_n^* S_{n-1,n} + \frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}M_n + \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}. \end{cases} \tag{3.22}$$

where $L_n = \sum_{k=1}^n {V_k}^2$ and

$$R_{n1} = \Big(2\theta_n\rho_n(\theta_n+\rho_n)\theta_n^* - (\theta_n+\rho_n)^2 - (\theta_n\rho_n)^2\Big)X_{n,n}^2 + \Big(2(\theta_n+\rho_n) - 2\theta_n\rho_n\theta_n^*\Big)M_n$$
$$- 2\theta_n\rho_n N_n + \Big(2\theta_n\rho_n(\theta_n+\rho_n) - 2(\theta_n\rho_n)^2\theta_n^*\Big)X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} - (\theta_n\rho_n)^2X_{n-1,n}^2.$$

By simple calculation, we can write that

$$\frac{1+\theta_n\rho_n}{(1-\theta_n\rho_n)(1-\theta_n^2)(1-\rho_n^2)} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\kappa_n^3}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} + o(\kappa_n^3), & \text{Case I} \\ -\frac{\kappa_n(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{8\gamma_1\gamma_2} + o(\kappa_n), & \text{Case II} \end{cases} \tag{3.23}$$

and

$$\theta_n^* = \begin{cases} 1+O(\kappa_n^{-2}), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{\gamma_2-\gamma_1}{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} + O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}, \quad \frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} = \begin{cases} 1+O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case I} \\ -\frac{\kappa_n}{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} + O(1), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}. \tag{3.24}$$

According to Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2 and part (a) of this lemma, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|R_{n1}|}{n} > \delta\right) = -\infty \tag{3.25}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{L_n}{n} - \sigma^2\right| > \delta\right) = -\infty, \tag{3.26}$$

where $a_n = b_n$ in (Case I) and $a_n = \lambda_n$ in (Case II). Then, part (b) can be achieved by (3.22)-(3.26).

Now, we turn to the proof of part (c). Similar to the proof of part (a), we can get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\max_{1\le k\le n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2}{a_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, \tag{3.27}$$

where $a_n = b_n$ in (Case I) and $a_n = \lambda_n$ in (Case II). Moreover, since

$$T_n = \frac{\varepsilon_{n,n}^2 + L_n + 2\rho_n U_n}{1-\rho_n^2} = -\frac{\kappa_n\left(\varepsilon_{n,n}^2 + L_n + 2\rho_n U_n\right)}{\gamma_2\left(2+\frac{\gamma_2}{\kappa_n}\right)},$$

applying (3.26), (3.27) and Lemma 3.2, we can complete the proof of part (c).

Finally, if note that

$$Q_n = \frac{1}{2}\left((1-\theta_n^2)S_n + \theta_n^2 X_{n,n}^2 + T_n\right), \tag{3.28}$$

then, parts (a)-(c) in this lemma, immediately yield part (d). □

4. Moderate deviations for $\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n$ and $\hat{d}_n$

This section is devoted to the moderate deviations for the estimators $\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n$ and $\hat{d}_n$ under (Case I) and (Case II). Similar to the definition of Z_n, let

$$\tilde{Z}_{l,n} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{l,n} \\ \\ U_{l,n} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{Z}_{n,n} := \tilde{Z}_n. \tag{4.1}$$

4.1. **Moderate deviations for $(\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\rho}_n)$.** From the decomposition (3.7), we first establish the moderate deviations for Z_n and $\tilde{Z}_n$ according to the methods used in Lemma 4.9 of Bitseki Penda *et al.* [5]. For the readability of the paper, its proof is postponed to the appendix. However, it should be noted that our truncation methods are somewhat different from those of [5]. Next, we deal with the matrices Y_n and $\tilde{Y}_n$, and show that they are exponentially equivalent to some deterministic matrices. Finally, we can complete the proof of Theorem 2.1 by establishing the asymptotic negligibility of $R_n(\theta,\rho)/b_n$ and $\tilde{R}_n(\theta,\rho)/\lambda_n$ in the sense of moderate deviations.

Lemma 4.1. *(a) Under (Case I), $\left\{\frac{Z_n}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}, n \geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with the speed b_n^2 and good rate function $I_Z(x) = \frac{x^\tau \Theta^{-1} x}{2}$, where*

$$\Theta = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\sigma^4}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} & \frac{\sigma^4}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \\ \frac{\sigma^4}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} & -\frac{\sigma^4}{2\gamma_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(b) Under (Case II), $\left\{\frac{\tilde{Z}_n}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}, n \geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with the speed λ_n^2 and good rate function $J_{\tilde{Z}}(x) = \frac{x^\tau \tilde{\Theta}^{-1} x}{2}$, where

$$\tilde{\Theta} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)\sigma^4}{8\gamma_1\gamma_2} & -\frac{\sigma^4}{4\gamma_2} \\ -\frac{\sigma^4}{4\gamma_2} & -\frac{\sigma^4}{2\gamma_2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

As an application, we can get the moderate deviations for $\hat{\theta}_n$.

Corollary 4.1. *(a) Under (Case I), $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*), n \geq 1\right\}$ satisfy the large deviation principle with speed b_n^2 and good rate functions*

$$I_\theta(x) = -\frac{x^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}.$$

(b) Under (Case II), $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}}{\lambda_n}(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*),\, n\geq 1\right\}$ *satisfy the large deviation principle with speed* λ_n^2 *and good rate functions*

$$J_\theta(x) := -\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3x^2}{16\gamma_1\gamma_2}.$$

Proof. (a) Under (Case I), from the contraction principle in large deviations [10] and Lemma 4.1, it follows that $\left\{\frac{M_n}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}, n\geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviations with speed b_n^2 and the good rate function

$$I_M(x) = -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\sigma^4}x^2.$$

Together with Lemma 3.3 (b), $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}\frac{M_n}{S_{n-1,n}}, n\geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviations with speed b_n^2 and good rate function

$$I_\theta(x) = -\frac{x^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)},\quad x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore, to prove the result, by (3.3), it is sufficient to show that, for all $\delta>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{\theta_n\rho_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)b_n}\frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{S_{n-1,n}}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{4.2}$$

In fact, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P\left(\left|\frac{\theta_n\rho_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)b_n}\frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{S_{n-1,n}}\right|>\delta\right)\\
&\leq P\left(\left|\frac{S_n}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>-\frac{\sigma^2}{4\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right)\\
&\quad+P\left(\left|\frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}\right|>-\frac{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)\sigma^2\delta}{4\theta_n\rho_n\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which achieves the proof of (4.2) by Lemma 3.3 (a)-(b).

(b) Under (Case II), according to (3.3), Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 4.1, we can get part (b) of this corollary by the same methods as in the proof of part (a). □

Now, we turn to analyze the matrix Y_n defined as in the decomposition (3.9). From the equation (B.12) in Bercu & Proïa [4], it follows that

$$J_{n-1,n} = (1+\theta_n^*)(1-\theta_n^*)S_n - \frac{2\theta_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}M_n - (\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)G_n + \xi_n^J. \tag{4.3}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_n &= 2P_n - 2\theta_n^*S_n - (\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)S_n\\
&= 2\left(\frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}M_n + \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} - \theta_n^*X_{n,n}^2\right) - (\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)S_n.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Lemma 4.2. *Letting $a_n = b_n$ in (Case I) and $a_n = \lambda_n$ in (Case II), then*
(a) for any $\delta > 0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|\xi_n^J|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty$;
(b) for any $\delta > 0$, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\left|\frac{J_{n-1,n}}{n\kappa_n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right| > \delta\right) = -\infty$.

Proof. Since

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n\kappa_n}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} = \infty, & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n\kappa_n}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} = \infty, & \text{Case II} \end{cases},$$

it follows from Lemma 3.3 (a) that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}| \vee X_{n,n}^2}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty, \tag{4.5}$$

which implies that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|\xi_n^P|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty.$$

Therefore, by the definition of ξ_n^J (refer to (3.6)), to prove part (a), it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty \tag{4.6}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|(\hat{\theta}_n^2 - (\theta_n^*)^2)(X_{n,n}^2 + X_{n-1,n}^2)|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty. \tag{4.7}$$

We only proof (4.6) and (4.7) under (Case I), and the proof under (Case II) is similar and omitted here. In fact, for any $L > 0$, under (Case I), one can see that

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\frac{|(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta\right) \\ &\le P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*|}{b_n} > L\right) + P\left(\frac{b_n|X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}|}{n\kappa_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \frac{\delta}{L}\right) \end{aligned}$$

According to (4.5), we can write that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{b_n|X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}|}{n\kappa_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \frac{\delta}{L}\right) = -\infty$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*|}{b_n} > L\right) = \frac{L^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}.$$

Then we complete the proof of (4.6) by taking $L \to +\infty$. Moreover, by the Delta method in moderate deviations [14] and Corollary 4.1, $\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}(\hat{\theta}_n^2 - (\theta_n^*)^2), n \ge 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with speed b_n^2 and the good rate function

$$\tilde{I}_\theta(x) = -\frac{x^2}{4\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence, similar to the proof of (4.6), we can get (4.7) immediately.

As for part (b), we can deduce that

$$(1+\theta_n^*)(1-\theta_n^*) = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2}{\kappa_n^2} + o(\kappa_n^{-2}), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{4\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^2} + o(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, using Lemma 3.3 (b),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\left| \frac{(1+\theta_n^*)(1-\theta_n^*)}{n\kappa_n} S_n + \frac{\sigma^2}{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \right| > \delta \right) = -\infty. \tag{4.8}$$

By Lemma 3.2, (4.3), (4.8) and part (a) of this lemma, it is sufficient to show that, for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{|(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)G_n|}{n\kappa_n} > \delta \right) = -\infty. \tag{4.9}$$

Indeed, for any $L > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\frac{(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)^2 S_n}{n\kappa_n} > \delta \right) \\ & \le \begin{cases} P\left(\frac{n\kappa_n^3(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)^2}{b_n^2} > L \right) + P\left(\frac{b_n^2 S_n}{n^2\kappa_n^4} > \frac{\delta}{L} \right), & \text{Case I} \\ P\left(\frac{n\kappa_n(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)^2}{\lambda_n^2} > L \right) + P\left(\frac{\lambda_n^2 S_n}{n^2\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{L} \right), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

So, let $n \to +\infty$ and then $L \to +\infty$, by Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 4.1, we can obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)^2 S_n}{n\kappa_n} > \delta \right) = -\infty. \tag{4.10}$$

Similarly, One can easily see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\left| \left(\frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} M_n + \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} - \theta_n^* X_{n,n}^2 \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n} |\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*| > \delta \right) \\ & = -\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

Thus, (4.9) can be achieved by (4.10)-(4.11). □

Lemma 4.3. *For H_n defined by (3.6), we have the following results:*

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\left| \frac{H_n}{n} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \right| > \delta \right) = -\infty, & \textit{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\left| \frac{H_n}{n\kappa_n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} \right| > \delta \right) = -\infty, & \textit{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. According to (3.22), we can write that

$$\begin{aligned} W_n &:= \sum_{k=2}^{n} X_{k,n}X_{k-2,n} \\ &= (\theta_n+\rho_n)P_n - \theta_n\rho_n S_n + N_n - (\theta_n+\rho_n)X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} + \theta_n\rho_n(X_{n,n}+X_{n-1,n}) \\ &= \left((\theta_n+\rho_n)\theta_n^* - \theta_n\rho_n \right) S_n + R_{n3}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{n3} = N_n + \frac{\theta_n+\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} M_n - \frac{(\theta_n+\rho_n)(1-\theta_n\rho_n)}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} + \theta_n\rho_n(X_{n,n}+X_{n-1,n}) \\ - (\theta_n+\rho_n)\theta_n^* X_{n,n}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (4.4) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} H_n &= F_n - \rho_n^* G_n \\ &= \Big(S_n + Q_n - (\hat{\theta}_n + \theta_n^*)P_n\Big) - \rho_n^*\Big(2P_n - (\hat{\theta}_n + \theta_n^*)S_n\Big) \\ &= \frac{(1-\theta_n\rho_n)(1-\theta_n)(1-\rho_n)(1+\theta_n^*)}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} S_n + (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)(\rho_n^* S_n - P_n) + R_{n4}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

where $R_{n4} = R_{n3} - 2(\theta_n^* + \rho_n^*)\Big(\frac{1}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} M_n + \frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} - \theta_n^* X_{n,n}^2\Big)$.

Applying Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3 and Corollary 4.1, we have for any $\delta > 0$

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{1}{n}\left|(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)(\rho_n^* S_n - P_n) + R_{n4}\right| \geq \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n}\left|(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)(\rho_n^* S_n - P_n) + R_{n4}\right| \geq \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case II} \end{cases}. \tag{4.13}$$

Furthermore, by some simple calculations,

$$\frac{(1-\theta_n\rho_n)(1-\theta_n)(1-\rho_n)(1+\theta_n^*)}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\kappa_n^3} + O(\kappa_n^{-4}), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^2} + O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Together with Lemma 3.3, (4.12) and (4.13), we complete the proof of this lemma. □

Lemma 4.4. *Letting Y_n and $\tilde{Y}_n$ defined by (3.9) and (3.10) respectively, we have for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\|Y_n - \Upsilon\| > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \textit{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\|\tilde{Y}_n - \tilde{\Upsilon}\| > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \textit{Case II} \end{cases},$$

where

$$\Upsilon := \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\sigma^2} & 0 \\ -\frac{2\gamma_1(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\sigma^2} & -\frac{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{\sigma^2} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \tilde{\Upsilon} := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^2\sigma^2} \\ -\frac{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^2\sigma^2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Under (Case II), since

$$1 + \theta_n\rho_n = -\frac{\gamma_1+\gamma_2}{\kappa_n} - \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2}{\kappa_n^2},$$

according to Lemma 4.3, we have for any $\delta > 0$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\left|\frac{H_n}{S_{n-1,n}(1+\theta_n\rho_n)\kappa_n} + \frac{8\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}\right| > \delta\right) = -\infty. \tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, note that

$$\frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n} = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{\gamma_1}{\kappa_n} + O(\kappa_n^{-2}), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{\gamma_2-\gamma_1}{\gamma_1+\gamma_2} + O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\frac{1+\theta_n^*\rho_n^*}{1+\theta_n\rho_n} = \begin{cases} 1 + O(1/\kappa_n^2), & \text{Case I} \\ -\frac{4\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}\kappa_n + O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Then, together with Lemma 3.3, Lemma 4.2 and (4.14), we can complete the proof of this lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Under (Case I), from Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.4, we know that the sequence $\left\{\frac{1}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}Y_nZ_n, n\geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with speed b_n^2 and the rate function

$$I_{Y,Z}(x)=-\frac{x^\tau(\Upsilon\Theta\Upsilon^\tau)^{-1}x}{2},\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^2.$$

Note that

$$\Upsilon\Theta\Upsilon^\tau=\begin{pmatrix}-\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}{2} & 0\\ 0 & -2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)\end{pmatrix}=\Gamma,$$

hence, we have $I_{Y,Z}(x)=I_{\theta,\rho}(x)$.

On the other hand, under (Case II), using Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.4 again, each component of $\left\{\frac{1}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}\tilde{Y}_nM_n, n\geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with speed λ_n^2 and the rate function

$$J(x)=-\frac{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}{16\gamma_1\gamma_2}x^2,\quad x\in\mathbb{R}.$$

Recalling the decomposition (3.7), to obtain our main result, we only need to prove that

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|R_n(\theta,\rho)|}{b_n}>\delta\right)=-\infty), & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\tilde{R}_n(\theta,\rho)|}{\lambda_n}>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases}. \tag{4.15}$$

In fact, under (Case I), similar to the proof of (4.6), we can obtain by Lemma 4.3 that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|(\hat{\theta}_n-\theta_n^*)H_n|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{4.16}$$

Moreover, under (Case II), by Lemma 4.1 and (4.14),

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\left|\frac{\theta_n^*}{\theta_n}U_n-\frac{\theta_n\rho_n}{1+\theta_n\rho_n}\cdot\frac{X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}}{S_{n-1,n}}H_n\right|}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{4.17}$$

Therefore, to prove (4.15), by Lemma 4.2, (4.16) and (4.17), we need to show the following result:

$$\begin{cases}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\xi_n^I-\rho_n^*\xi_n^J|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case I}\\ \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\xi_n^I-\rho_n^*\xi_n^J|}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}>\delta\right)=-\infty, & \text{Case II}\end{cases}. \tag{4.18}$$

Proof of (4.18). By straightforward calculations, we get that

$$\xi_n^I-\rho_n^*\xi_n^J=\Delta_{n1}+\Delta_{n2}, \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\Delta_{n1}:=\frac{\theta_n\rho_n(1-\theta_n^2)(1-\rho_n^2)}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)^3}X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n}+\rho_n^*(\theta_n^*+1)(\theta_n^*-1)X_{n-1,n}^2$$

and

$$\Delta_{n2} := \left((\theta_n^*)^2 - \hat{\theta}_n^2 + 2\rho_n^*(\theta_n^* - \hat{\theta}_n)\right) X_{n,n}X_{n-1,n} + \left(\rho_n^*(\hat{\theta}_n^2 - (\theta_n^*)^2) + (\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_n^*)\right) X_{n,n}^2 + \rho_n^*\left(\hat{\theta}_n^2 - (\theta_n^*)^2\right) X_{n-1,n}^2.$$

Some simple calculations imply that

$$\frac{\theta_n\rho_n(1-\theta_n^2)(1-\rho_n^2)}{(1+\theta_n\rho_n)^3} = \begin{cases} \frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2}{2\kappa_n^2} + O\left(\kappa_n^{-3}\right), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{4\gamma_1\gamma_2}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3}\kappa_n + O(1), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\rho_n^*(\theta_n^*+1)(\theta_n^*-1) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2}{\kappa_n^2} + O\left(\kappa_n^{-3}\right), & \text{Case I} \\ \frac{4\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_2-\gamma_1)}{(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^3} + O(\kappa_n^{-1}), & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Hence, it follows that, from Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\Delta_{n1}|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\Delta_{n1}|}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

Moreover, by Lemma 3.3, Corollary 4.1 and the similar methods as in the proof of (4.7), we also get

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\Delta_{n2}|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|\Delta_{n2}|}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case II} \end{cases}.$$

That is to say, we prove the equation (4.18). □

4.2. **Moderate deviations for $\hat{d}_n$.** For the sake of the readers, let us recall some notations defined in previous sections,

$$J_n := J_{n,n} := \sum_{k=1}^{n} \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2, \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_n^2 := \hat{\varepsilon}_{n,n}^2, \quad \hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2 := X_{k,n} - \hat{\theta}_n X_{k-1,n}$$

and the Durbin-Watson statistic,

$$\hat{d}_n := \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}(\hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{k-1,n})^2}{\sum_{k=1}^{n}\hat{\varepsilon}_{k,n}^2}, \quad d^* := 2(1-\rho_n^*) = 2(1-\theta_n\rho_n\theta_n^*).$$

Putting $f_n := \hat{\varepsilon}_n^2/J_n$, from the equation (C.4) in Bercu & Proïa [4], we know that

$$\hat{d}_n - d_n^* = -2(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*) + R_n(d), \tag{4.20}$$

where, $R_n(d) = 2(\hat{\rho}_n - \rho_n^*)f_n + (2\rho_n^* - 1)f_n$.

Proof of Corollary 2.1. By (4.20), Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2, it is sufficient to show the asymptotic negligibility of $R_n(d)$, i.e. for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{cases} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}|R_n(d)|}{b_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case I} \\ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n/\kappa_n}|R_n(d)|}{\lambda_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty, & \text{Case II} \end{cases}. \tag{4.21}$$

We only prove (4.21) under (Case I), while the proof under (Case II) is similar and omitted here. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= \frac{\left((\theta_n^* - \hat{\theta}_n)X_{k-1,n} + (\theta_n - \theta_n^*)X_{n-1,n} + \varepsilon_{n,n}\right)^2}{J_n} \\ &\le \frac{4}{J_n}\left((\theta_n^* - \hat{\theta}_n)^2 X_{n-1,n}^2 + (\theta_n - \theta_n^*)^2 X_{n-1,n}^2 + \varepsilon_{n,n}^2\right), \end{aligned}$$

therefore, for any $L > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}|f_n|}{b_n} > \delta\right) \\ &\le P\left(\left|\frac{J_n}{n\kappa_n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right| > -\frac{\sigma^2}{4(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right) \\ &\quad + P\left(\frac{(\theta_n^* - \hat{\theta}_n)^2 X_{n-1,n}^2 + (\theta_n - \theta_n^*)^2 X_{n-1,n}^2 + \varepsilon_{n,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > -\frac{\sigma^2}{16(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right) \\ &\le P\left(\left|\frac{J_n}{n\kappa_n} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right| > -\frac{\sigma^2}{4(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right) + P\left(\frac{\varepsilon_{n,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > -\frac{\sigma^2}{48(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right) \\ &\quad + P\left(\frac{X_{n-1,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > -\frac{\sigma^2}{48(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)\kappa_n(\theta_n - \theta_n^*)^2}\right) + P\left(\frac{n\kappa_n^3}{b_n^2}(\theta_n^* - \hat{\theta}_n)^2 > L\right) \\ &\quad + P\left(\frac{X_{n-1,n}^2}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > -\frac{n\kappa_n^2\sigma^2}{48(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)Lb_n^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$ and then $L \to +\infty$, we can obtain that, by Lemma 3.3, the equation (3.27), Corollary 4.1 and Lemma 4.2,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}|f_n|}{b_n} > \delta\right) = -\infty.$$

This completes the proof of Corollary 2.1.

5. Technical appendix and proofs

In order to prove Lemma 4.1, we need a simplified version on the results of Puhalskii [23] as to the moderate deviations for a sequence of martingale differences.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\{m_{k,n}, 1 \le k \le n\}$ be a triangular array of martingale differences with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with respect to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{k,n}, 1 \le k \le n\}$. Let $\{a_n, n \ge 1\}$ be a sequence of real numbers satisfying that as $n \to +\infty$*

$$a_n \to \infty, \quad \frac{n}{a_n^2} \to \infty.$$

Suppose that there exists a symmetric positive-semidefinite matrix Q such that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P\left(\left\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} E\left(m_{k,n}m_{k,n}^\tau | \mathcal{F}_{k-1,n}\right) - Q\right\| > \delta\right) = -\infty, \tag{5.1}$$

where $\|M\|$ stands for the euclidean norm of matrix M. Suppose that there exists a constant $c>0$ such that for each $1\le k\le n$,

$$|m_{k,n}|\le c\frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n},\quad a.s. \tag{5.2}$$

Moreover, suppose that for all $a>0$ and $\delta>0$, we have the exponential Lindeberg's condition

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{a_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}E\left(|m_{k,n}|^2 I_{\{|m_{k,n}|\ge a\frac{\sqrt{n}}{a_n}\}}\Big|\mathcal{F}_{k-1,n}\right)\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.3}$$

Then, the sequence $\left\{\frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n}m_{k,n}}{\sqrt{n}a_n},n\ge1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviation principle with the speed b_n^2 and good rate function

$$\Lambda^*(x)=\sup_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left\{\lambda^\tau x-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^\tau Q\lambda\right\}.$$

In particular, if Q is invertible, $\Lambda^*(x)=\frac{1}{2}x^\tau Q^{-1}x$.

Proof of Lemma 4.1. The results of this lemma will be proved under (Case I) and (Case II) respectively.

(1). Case I. Firstly, we introduce the following modifications of the martingale arrays $\{M_{l,n},1\le l\le n\}$ and $\{U_{l,n},1\le l\le n\}$, which are slightly different from the equation (4.77) in Bitseki Penda *et al.* [5]. For any $r>0$ and $1\le l\le n$,

$$M_{l,n}^{(r)}:=\sum_{k=1}^{l}X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}V_k^{(n)},\ U_{l,n}^{(r)}:=\sum_{k=1}^{l}\varepsilon_{k-1,n}^{(r)}V_k^{(n)},\ M_{n,n}^{(r)}:=M_n^{(r)},\ U_{n,n}^{(r)}:=U_n^{(r)}, \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}V_k^{(n)}&:=V_kI_{\{|V_k|\le\sqrt{\kappa_n}\}}-E\left(V_kI_{\{|V_k|\le\sqrt{\kappa_n}\}}\right),\\ X_{k,n}^{(r)}&:=X_{k,n}I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|\le r\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{b_n}\right\}}\quad\text{and}\quad\varepsilon_{k,n}^{(r)}:=\varepsilon_{k,n}I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|\le r\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\right\}}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Let

$$Z_{l,n}^{(r)}=\begin{pmatrix}\frac{M_{l,n}^{(r)}}{\kappa_n}\\ \\ U_{l,n}^{(r)}\end{pmatrix}:=\sum_{k=1}^{l}m_{k,n}^{(r)},\qquad Z_n^{(r)}:=Z_{n,n}^{(r)}.$$

We divide our proofs into the following two steps.

Step 1. *To prove that $\left\{\frac{Z_n^{(r)}}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}},n\ge1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviations with the speed b_n^2 and good rate function*

$$I_Z(x)=\frac{x^\tau\Theta^{-1}x}{2}.$$

In fact, we only need to verify the conditions (5.1)-(5.3) in Lemma 5.1. Note that, for any $1\le k\le n$,

$$\frac{1}{\kappa_n}|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}V_k^{(n)}|\le r\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n},\qquad|\varepsilon_{k-1,n}^{(r)}V_k^{(n)}|\le r\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n}, \tag{5.6}$$

hence, for all $r_0 > 0$, we can write that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\sigma_n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} E\left(|m_{k,n}^{(r)}|^2 I_{\left\{|m_{k,n}^{(r)}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n}\right\}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{k-1,n}\right)\\
&\le \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\frac{X_{k,n}^2}{\kappa_n^2}+\varepsilon_{k,n}^2\right) I_{\left\{|\frac{X_{k,n}}{\kappa_n}|+|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\right\}}\\
&\le \frac{1}{\kappa_n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{2b_n}\right\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n}\right\}}\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\kappa_n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n}\right\}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{2b_n}\right\}},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_n^2 = E\left(V_1^{(n)}\right)^2$. Now applying (3.19), we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{2b_n}\right\}} \le \frac{4b_n^2}{r_0^2 n\kappa_n^2}\Xi_n \le \frac{4b_n^2\kappa_n^6}{r_0^2\gamma_1^4\gamma_2^4 n}\Lambda_n$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n}\right\}} \le \frac{4b_n^2}{r_0^2 n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^4 \le \frac{4b_n^2\kappa_n^4}{r_0^2\gamma_2^4 n}\Lambda_n.$$

Therefore we can obtain that, for any $\delta > 0$,

$$P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{b_n}\right\}} > \delta\right) \le P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{b_n\sqrt{n}} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\delta r_0^2\gamma_1^4\gamma_2^4 n}{4b_n^2\kappa_n^3} - EV_1^4\right)\right)$$

and

$$P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{2b_n}\right\}} > \delta\right) \le P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{b_n\sqrt{n}} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\delta r_0^2\gamma_2^4 n}{4b_n^2\kappa_n^3} - EV_1^4\right)\right),$$

which implies by the condition (H-I) and Lemma 3.1 that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{b_n}\right\}} > \delta\right) = -\infty \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n}\right\}} > \delta\right) = -\infty. \tag{5.8}$$

Moreover, by Hölder inequality and (3.19),

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n}\right\}} \le \frac{4b_n^2}{r_0^2 n}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 \le \frac{4b_n^2\kappa_n^6}{r_0^2\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^4 n}\Lambda_n$$

and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{2b_n}\right\}} \le \frac{4b_n^2}{r_0^2 n\kappa_n^2}\sum_{k=1}^{n} X_{k,n}^2\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 \le \frac{4b_n^2\kappa_n^4}{r_0^2\gamma_1^2\gamma_2^4 n}\Lambda_n.$$

Therefore, similar to the proofs of (5.7) and (5.8), we can obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^{n}X_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|\varepsilon_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\right\}}>\delta\right)=-\infty \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\varepsilon_{k,n}^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{2b_n}\right\}}>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.10}$$

Now, from (5.7)-(5.10) and the fact that $\sigma_n^2\to\sigma^2$ as $n\to\infty$, it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n}\sum_{k=1}^{n}E\left(|m_{k,n}^{(r)}|^2 I_{\left\{|m_{k,n}^{(r)}|>r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}{b_n}\right\}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{k-1,n}\right)>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.11}$$

By the equations (5.6), (5.11) and Lemma 5.1, to complete the proof of **Step 1**, it is sufficient to show that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left\|\frac{<Z_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n}{n\kappa_n}-\Theta\right\|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.12}$$

Letting $S_{l,n}^{(r)}=\sum_{k=1}^{l}\left(X_{k,n}^{(r)}\right)^2, S_{n,n}^{(r)}:=S_n^{(r)}$, then

$$<X_{\bullet,n}^{(r,R)}>_n=\sigma_R^2 S_{n-1,n}^{(r)}.$$

We can write that, for any $\delta>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\left|\frac{<M_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2\sigma_n^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)\\&=P\left(\left|\frac{S_{n-1,n}}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\frac{\delta}{2\sigma_n^2}\right)+P\left(\left|\frac{S_{n-1,n}-S_{n-1,n}^{(r)}}{n\kappa_n^3}\right|>\frac{\delta}{2\sigma_n^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.3 and (5.7), it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{<M_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n}{n\kappa_n^3}+\frac{\sigma^2\sigma_n^2}{2\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.13}$$

Similarly, from Lemma 3.3, (5.8) and the fact that

$$<U_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n=\sigma_n^2\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\left(\varepsilon_{k,n}^{(r)}\right)^2,$$

it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{<U_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n}{n\kappa_n}+\frac{\sigma^2\sigma_n^2}{2\gamma_2}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.14}$$

The above discussions, together with (5.13) and (5.14), show that, in order to get (5.12), we only have to prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{<X_{\bullet,n}^{(r)},U_{\bullet,n}^{(r)}>_n}{n\kappa_n^2}-\frac{\sigma^2\sigma_n^2}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)}\right|>\delta\right)=-\infty. \tag{5.15}$$

In fact,

$$< X^{(r)}_{\bullet,n}, U^{(r)}_{\bullet,n} >_n = \sigma_n^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X^{(r)}_{k,n} \varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left| \frac{< X^{(r)}_{\bullet,n}, U^{(r)}_{\bullet,n} >_n}{n\kappa_n^2} - \frac{\sigma^2\sigma_n^2}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \right| > \delta \right) \\ & \le P\left(\left| \frac{Q_{n-1,n}}{n\kappa_n^2} - \frac{\sigma^2}{2\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \right| > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right) + P\left(\frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X^{(r)}_{k,n} \left(\varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n} - \varepsilon_{k,n} \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right) \\ & \quad + P\left(\frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n} \left(X^{(r)}_{k,n} - X_{k,n} \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Now, by Hölder inequality, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X^{(r)}_{k,n} \left(\varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n} - \varepsilon_{k,n} \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right) \\ & \le P\left(\frac{S_{n-1,n}}{n\kappa_n^3} > -\frac{\sigma^2}{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} \right) + P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varepsilon^2_{k,n} I_{\left\{ |\varepsilon_{k,n}| > r\frac{\sqrt{n}}{2b_n} \right\}} > -\frac{\gamma_1\gamma_2(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)\delta^2}{9\sigma^2\sigma_n^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.3 and (5.8), it follows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} X^{(r)}_{k,n} \left(\varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n} - \varepsilon_{k,n} \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right) = -\infty. \tag{5.17}$$

Similarly, by Lemma 3.3 and (5.7), we can obtain that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\left| \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \varepsilon^{(r)}_{k,n} \left(X^{(r)}_{k,n} - X_{k,n} \right) \right|}{n\kappa_n^2} > \frac{\delta}{3\sigma_n^2} \right) = -\infty. \tag{5.18}$$

Then, Lemma 3.3, together with (5.16)-(5.18), yields the equation (5.15).

Step 2. *To prove the exponential equivalence between $Z_n^{(r)}$ and Z_n, i.e. for all $\delta > 0$,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{b_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\left| Z_n - Z_n^{(r)} \right|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta \right) = -\infty. \tag{5.19}$$

In fact,

$$M_n - M_n^{(r)} = F_n^{(r)} + E_n^{(r)}, \tag{5.20}$$

where

$$F_n^{(r)} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(X_{k-1,n} - X^{(r)}_{k-1,n} \right) V_k, \ E^{(r)}_{l,n} = \sum_{k=1}^{l} X^{(r)}_{k-1,n} \left(V_k - V_k^{(n)} \right), \ E_n^{(r)} := E_n^{(r)}.$$

From (3.19), we have

$$\begin{aligned}|F_n^{(r)}| &\le \frac{b_n^2}{r^2 n\kappa_n^2}\left|\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^3 V_k\right| \\ &\le \frac{b_n^2}{r^2 n\kappa_n^2}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^4\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\sum_{k=1}^n X_{k-1,n}^2 V_k^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \frac{\kappa_n^4 b_n^2}{r^2\gamma_1^3\gamma_2^3 n}\Lambda_n.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by condition (H-I) and Lemma 3.1, one can see that

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{|F_n^{(r)}|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right) \\ &\le \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{\sqrt{n}b_n} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{r^2\gamma_1^3\gamma_2^3\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{\kappa_n^5}b_n} - EV_1^4\right)\right) = -\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

As for the item $E_n^{(r)}$, we also claim that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\left|E_n^{(r)}\right|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right) = -\infty. \tag{5.22}$$

In fact, $\left\{E_{l,n}^{(r)}, 1\le l\le n\right\}$ is a locally square-integrable martingale array. For all $1\le k\le n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\left|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}\left(V_k - V_k^{(n)}\right)\right| > b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}\right) \\ &\le P\left(\left|V_1 - V_1^{(n)}\right| > b_n^2\sqrt{\kappa_n}\right) \\ &\le \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}t_0 b_n^2\sqrt{\kappa_n}\right\} E\exp\left\{t_0|V_1|\right\},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log\left(n\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{1\le k\le n} P\left(\left|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}\left(V_k - V_k^{(n)}\right)\right| > b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}\right)\right) = -\infty. \tag{5.23}$$

Moreover, for all $r_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^n\left(E\left(X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}(V_k - V_k^{(n)})\right)^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}(V_k - V_k^{(n)})| > r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}\right\}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{k,n}\right) > \delta\right) \\ &\le P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^n\left(X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}\right)^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}| > r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{b_n^3}\right\}} > \frac{\delta}{\tilde{\sigma}_n^2}\right) + P\left(\max_{1\le k\le n}|V_k - V_k^{(n)}| \ge b_n^2\sqrt{\kappa_n}\right) \\ &\le P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{b_n\sqrt{n}} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\delta r_0^2\gamma_1^4\gamma_2^4 n}{b_n^6\kappa_n^3\tilde{\sigma}_n^2} - EV_1^4\right)\right) + nP\left(|V_1 - V_1^{(n)}| \ge b_n^2\sqrt{\kappa_n}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 := E(V_1 - V_1^{(n)})^2$. Now, since $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 \leq \frac{EV_1^4}{\kappa_n}$, we obtain that, from Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{b_n\sqrt{n}} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\delta r_0^2\gamma_1^4\gamma_2^4 n}{b_n^6\kappa_n^3\tilde{\sigma}_n^2} - EV_1^4\right)\right)\\ &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\Lambda_n - nEV_1^4}{b_n\sqrt{n}} > \frac{\sqrt{n}}{b_n}\left(\frac{\delta r_0^2\gamma_1^4\gamma_2^4 n}{b_n^6\kappa_n^2 EV_1^4} - EV_1^4\right)\right) = -\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{1}{n\kappa_n^3}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(E\left(X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}(V_k - V_k^{(n)})\right)^2 I_{\left\{|X_{k-1,n}^{(r)}(V_k - V_k^{(n)})| > r_0\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}{b_n}\right\}}\middle|\mathcal{F}_{k,n}\right) > \delta\right)\\ &= -\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Furthermore, for all $\delta > 0$, using Lemma 3.3, (5.7) and the fact that $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\left|\frac{< E_{\bullet,n}^{(r)} >_n}{n\kappa_n^3}\right| > \delta\right)\\ &= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log\left(P\left(\left|\frac{S_{n-1,n}}{n\kappa_n^3}\right| > \frac{\delta}{2\tilde{\sigma}_n^2}\right) + P\left(\left|\frac{S_{n-1,n} - S_{n-1,n}^{(r)}}{n\kappa_n^3}\right| > \frac{\delta}{2\tilde{\sigma}_n^2}\right)\right) = -\infty.\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

Finally, the above discussions, together with (5.23)-(5.25) and Theorem 1 in Djellout [11], show that $\left\{\frac{1}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}}E_n^{(r)}, n \geq 1\right\}$ satisfies the large deviations with the speed b_n^2 and good rate function

$$I_E(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } x = 0,\\ +\infty, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Hence, we complete the proof of (5.22). Obviously, (5.21) and (5.22) imply that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\left|M_n - M_n^{(r)}\right|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n^3}} > \delta\right) = -\infty. \tag{5.26}$$

Similar to the proof of (5.26), we can obtain that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{b_n^2}\log P\left(\frac{\left|U_n - U_n^{(r)}\right|}{b_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right) = -\infty, \tag{5.27}$$

which, together with (5.26), achieves the proof of (5.19).

(2). Case II. In this case, let $V_k^{(n)}, \varepsilon_{k,n}^{(r)}, U_{l,n}^{(r)}$ be defined as in (5.4) and (5.5). However, we need a new modifications of the martingale array $\{M_{l,n}, 1 \leq l \leq n\}$: for any $r > 0$ and $1 \leq l \leq n$,

$$\tilde{M}_{l,n}^{(r)} := \sum_{k=1}^{l}\tilde{X}_{k-1,n}^{(r)}V_k^{(n)}, \qquad \tilde{M}_{n,n}^{(r)} := \tilde{M}_n^{(r)},$$

where

$$\tilde{X}_{k,n}^{(r)} := X_{k,n} I_{\left\{|X_{k,n}| \le r\frac{\sqrt{n\kappa_n^2}}{b_n}\right\}}.$$

Moreover, let

$$\tilde{Z}_{l,n}^{(r)} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{M}_{l,n}^{(r)} \\ \\ U_{l,n}^{(r)} \end{pmatrix} := \sum_{k=1}^{l} \tilde{m}_{k,n}^{(r)}, \quad \tilde{Z}_n^{(r)} := \tilde{Z}_{n,n}^{(r)}.$$

Similar to (Case I), we can show that,

• $\left\{\frac{\tilde{Z}_n^{(r)}}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}}, n \ge 1\right\}$ *satisfies the large deviations with the speed* λ_n^2 *and good rate function*

$$J_{\tilde{Z}}(x) = \frac{x^\tau \tilde{\Theta}^{-1} x}{2};$$

• *the exponential equivalence between* $\tilde{Z}_n^{(r)}$ *and* $\tilde{Z}_n$*, i.e. for all* $\delta > 0$*,*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{\lambda_n^2} \log P\left(\frac{\left|\tilde{Z}_n - \tilde{Z}_n^{(r)}\right|}{\lambda_n\sqrt{n\kappa_n}} > \delta\right) = -\infty.$$

To be noted that in this step, we need the conditions:

$$\frac{n}{\lambda_n^6\kappa_n^6} \to \infty, \qquad \frac{n}{\lambda_n^2\kappa_n^{11}} \to \infty.$$

Acknowledgements

The work of H. Jiang was partially supported by NSF (No.11101210), and that of G. Yang was partially supported by NSFC (No. 11201431).

References

[1] Anderson, T. W. On asymptotic distributions of estimators of parameters of stochastic difference equations. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 30 (1959): 676-687.

[2] Bercu, B. On large deviations in the Gaussian autoregressive process: stable, unstabel and explosive cases. *Bernoulli*, 7 (2001): 299-316.

[3] Bercu, B., Touati, A. Exponential inequalities for self-normalized martingales with applications. *Annals of Applied Probability*, 18 (2008): 1848-1869.

[4] Bercu, B., Proïa, F. A sharp analysis on the asymptotic behavior of the Durbin-Watson statistic for the First-order autoregressive process. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 17 (2013): 500-530.

[5] Bitseki Penda, S. V., Djellout, H., Proïa,F. Moderate deviations for the Durbin-Watson statistic related to the first-order autoregressive process. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 18 (2014): 308-331.

[6] Bobkoski, M. J. *Hypothesis testing in nonstationary time series*. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Statistics, University of Wisconsin, 1983.

[7] Cavanagh, C. *Roots local to unity*. Manuscript, Department of Economics, Harvard University, 1985.

[8] Chan, N. H., Wei, C. Z. Asymptotic inference for nearly nonstationary AR(1) processes. *Annals of Statistics*, 15 (1987): 1050-1063.

[9] Chen, X. Moderate deviations for m-dependent random variables with Banach space value. *Statistics and Probability Letters*, 35 (1998): 123-134.

[10] Dembo, A., Zeitouni, O. *Large deviations techniques and applications, second edition, vol. 38 of Applications of Mathematics*. Springer. 1998.

[11] Djellout, H. Moderate deviations for martingale differences and applications to ϕ-mixing sequences. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 73 (2002): 203-217.

[12] Dickey, D. A., Fuller, W. A. Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with a unit root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74 (1979): 427-431.
[13] Eichelsbacher, P., Löwe, M. Moderate deviations for i.i.d. random variables. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics*, 7 (2003): 209-218.
[14] Gao, F. Q., Zhao, X. Q. Delta method in large deviations and moderate deviations for estimators. *Annals of Statistics*, 39 (2011): 1211-1240.
[15] Jiang, H., Yu, M. M. and Yang, G. Y. Limit theory for mildly autoregressive models with dependent errors. *Preprint*.
[16] King, M. L. Introduction to Durbin and Waston (1950,1951) testing for serial correlation in least squares regression.I, II. S.kotz et al. (eds.), Breakthroughs in Statistics, Springer-Verlag New York, Inc. 1992. 229-236.
[17] Ledoux, M. Sur les déviations modérées des sommes de variables aléatoires vectorielles indépendantes de même loi. Ann. Inst. Henri-Poincaré. 35 (1992): 123-134.
[18] Miao, Y., Shen, S. Moderate deviation principle for autoregressive processes. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 100 (2009): 1952-1961.
[19] Miao, Y., Wang, Y. L., Yang, G. Y. Moderate deviations principle for empirical covariance from a unit root. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 42 (2015), 234-255.
[20] Nabeya, S., Perron, P. Local asymptotic distributions related to the AR(1) model with dependent errors. *Journal of Econometrics*, 62 (1994): 229-264.
[21] Phillips, P. C. B. Regression theory for near-integrated time series. *Econometrica*, 56 (1988): 1021-1043.
[22] Phillips, P. C. B., Magdalinos, T. Limit theory for moderate deviations from a unit root. *Journal of Econometrics*, 136 (2007): 115-130.
[23] Puhalskii, A. Large deviations of semimartingales: a maxingale problem approach. I. Limits as solutions to a maxingale problem. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 61 (1997): 141-243.
[24] White, J. S. The limiting distribution of the serial correlation coefficient in the explosive case. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 29 (1958), 1188-1197.
[25] Worms, J. Moderate deviations for stable Markov chains and regression models. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 4 (1999): 1-28.